

From: Miller, Garyg
To: ["David Keith"](#)
Subject: RE: San Jacinto River Waste Pits Superfund Site (Draft Feasibility Study Report)
Date: Tuesday, February 11, 2014 1:40:00 PM

Yes, it applies to water depths of 10 feet or less, except for areas where the dioxin/furan is greater than 13,000 ng/kg. Anything with dioxin/furan greater than 13,000 ng/kg would be included in the alternative regardless of depth. Please let me know if you want to discuss this further.

Regards,

Gary Miller
EPA Remedial Project Manager
214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: David Keith [<mailto:dkeith@anchorgea.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2014 1:31 PM
To: Miller, Garyg
Subject: Re: San Jacinto River Waste Pits Superfund Site (Draft Feasibility Study Report)

Gary, can you please confirm the depth we are to consider for the new removal alternative is water depths of 10 feet or less?

Thanks,
David

Sent from my iPhone

> On Feb 10, 2014, at 2:32 PM, "Miller, Garyg" <Miller.Garyg@epa.gov> wrote:
>
> David,
>
> Following a reconsideration of the comments submitted regarding the Draft Feasibility Study for the San Jacinto Waste Pits Superfund Site, the EPA is making the following modifications to the original comments dated January 15, 2014 (original comments letter attached to this email):
>
>
> 1. (Revised Original Comment #3): An additional remedial action alternative shall be included for the northern waste pits. This new alternative shall evaluate a removal that addresses a volume of material that contains dioxin/furan at levels greater than 220 ng/kg, except where the water depth is greater than 10 feet. Where the dioxin/furan levels are greater than 13,000 ng/kg, the water depth limit shall not apply. This alternative shall also include an engineered control (sheet pile, berm, etc.) to isolate the excavated area from the river (unless constrained by river hydrologic/USACE requirements). An engineering control would improve the containment of re-suspended sediment during removal, which would reduce impacts to water quality, sediment quality, and fish. The excavation could be sequenced to work from the center of the area that is above mean tide level towards the perimeter. The new alternative shall also consider the impacts of this construction on the river hydrologic conditions, need for USACE permits, etc.
>
> 2. (Revised original Comment #7): The FS only considers institutional controls for the Southern Impoundment area. The FS shall include a range of alternatives for this area similar to the range of alternatives in the northern waste pits.
>
> 3. Delete original comment #21 regarding post flood activities and dredging.
>



9493955

> 4. All of the other comments remain as before.
>
>
>
> The comments, as modified above, shall be incorporated in the Final Feasibility Study Report and
copies provided for review and approval by March 21, 2014.
>
>
>
> Regards,
>
> Gary Miller
> EPA Remedial Project Manager
> 214-665-8318
> miller.garyg@epa.gov<<mailto:miller.garyg@epa.gov>>
>
> From: Miller, Garyg
> Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2014 11:20 AM
> To: David Keith
> Subject: FW: San Jacinto River Waste Pits Superfund Site (Draft Feasibility Study Report)
>
> David,
>
> Comments on the draft San Jacinto FS, please let me know if you have any questions, or would like
to have a call on this.
>
> Regards,
>
> Gary Miller
> EPA Remedial Project Manager
> 214-665-8318
> miller.garyg@epa.gov<<mailto:miller.garyg@epa.gov>>
>
> <MILLER - San Jacinto ltr to David Keith-draft FS report (01-15-14).pdf>